



Social Capital, Lever Performance of Agricultural Cooperatives: Review of the Literature on Social Capital

Elamri Kaltoum¹ & Aquelmoun Abdesalam²

¹Management science research laboratory, National School of Commerce and Management, University Ibn Zohr Agadir, Morocco

²Management science research laboratory, National School of Commerce and Management, University Ibn Zohr Agadir, Morocco

Abstract

The concept of "social capital" knows today a success of esteem in the social sciences. Evidenced in the first place and the many articles published in the past few years in the field of sociology, political science, economics and social sciences and even in the history books. After a growing interest in research communities in the social sciences, governments of industrialized countries and major international organizations have taken the concept to better decipher social situations, political or economic supplanting the passage of other countries even approaches dominant there. However the success that knows the concept of social capital is responding to changes in current theoretical research in the social sciences since the early 80s and especially with the booming development of the reflections which now call for trust, networks, reciprocity ... to give a reason for changing social relations in modern societies.

In this paper, in the form of review of the literature on social capital, we will attempt to try to define the concept and its different meanings with the aim of its conceptualization in the context of our doctoral research.

Key words: Social capital, conceptualization, network, Social networks, Confidence, Social norms.

Introduction

The concept of "social capital" knows today a success of esteem in the social sciences. Evidenced in the first place and the many articles published in the past few years in the field of sociology, political science, economics and social sciences and even in the history books. After a growing interest in research communities in the social sciences, governments of industrialized countries and major international organizations have taken the concept to better decipher social situations, political or economic supplanting the passage of other countries even approaches dominant there.

Although the idea of social capital dates back to the 19th century with the work of Alexis de Tocqueville (1835) and Emile Durkheim (1893), it was the beginning of the 20th century that the first known mention of this expression in a book that discusses the importance of social capital for education and local communities (Hanifan, 1920). However the success that knows the concept of social capital is responding to changes in current theoretical research in the social sciences since the early 80s and especially with the booming development of the reflections which now call for trust, networks, reciprocity ... to give a reason for changing social relations in modern societies. A multiform concept, the social capital was approached in different ways and in different disciplines and fields (Lin, 1995, 2001), Collier (1998), Narayan (1999), Dasgupta and Grootaert (2000), Woolcock and Narayan (2000), Uphoff (2000). These researchers from different backgrounds are endeavoring to identify the different aspects of social relations and to highlight their implications for different social phenomena, political and economic.

In this paper, in the form of review of the literature on social capital, we will attempt to try to define the concept and its different meanings with the aim of its conceptualization in the context of our doctoral research. So we come back in first place on the foundations and evolution of the concept in an attempt to summarize the progress of the various schools of thought on the concept and approaches. Then, in a second point to draw a critical analysis of different definitions and approaches to social capital and subsequently attempt to conceptualize and to identify the main dimensions that will help us to build our theoretical model.

1. SOCIAL CAPITAL: EVOLUTION, DEFINITION AND APPROACHES

The concept of social capital as we accept it today originated there over thirty years, thanks to the works of sociologists such as Jane Jacobs (1961), Bourdieu (1979, 1985). Then, after Coleman (1988), Fukuyama (1995, 1999), Woolcock (1998) and the American political scientist Robert Putnam (1993, 2000). Researchers in the fields of economics as Durlauf (2001), Helliwell (2001, 1998, 1996), Gleaser (2001, 1999), Knack and Keefer (1997) and health (Lynch et al 1998), Wilkinson (1999; 1996), Kawachi et al (1997) have also contributed to it. However, if we go back to the genealogical evolution of the concept we can find its beginnings already with Hobbes which makes allusion already in 1651 in Leviathan: "*Having friends is to have power.*" (Degenne and Forsé (1994)), and in the nineteenth century in the writings of Alexis de Tocqueville or in the work of Emile Durkheim (1893), and in the early twentieth century in the research of Lyda Judson Hanifan (1920) which we have current terminology. Hanifan already identified the public and private benefits of social capital when he said that the whole community should benefit from enhanced while the individual, on the other hand cooperation, civic engagement be in an essential form of support. The author then defines social capital as "*tangible substances that Count for MOST in the daily lives of people: Namely Good Will, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse Among the Individuals and families Who make up a social unit*" (Bourdieu, 1986).

1.1 Genesis of the social capital

The various work and research that has tried to bring genealogy clarification on the concept of social capital most often attribute authorship of this concept sociologist Alexis de Tocqueville. In the introduction to his article of 1995 (Democracy in America), Robert Putnam cites Alexis de Tocqueville to recall that, when the latter visited the United States in the 1830s, "it was the Americans' propensity for civic association that most impressed him as the key to their unprecedented ability to make democracy work" (Putnam, 1995, p. 65). This is the same author that Fukuyama refers when he began to set, too, the social capital. "The political function of social capital in a modern democracy was best elucidated by Alexis de Tocqueville in democracy in America, who used the phrase the "Art of association" to describe Americans' propensity for civil association" (1999, p.4). A. de Tocqueville develops a reflection on the understood not as a form of government but as a historical movement that led to the equalizer conditions democracy. When staying in the United States, Alexis de Tocqueville noted that its inhabitants know how to dispose of the propensity to selfishness and take it upon themselves to take part in communal affairs, "the inhabitant of the United States learns from birth that it must rely on itself to fight against the evils and embarrassments of life; it throws on the social authority that look suspicious and anxious, and calls to his power when he cannot do without (...) In the United States, it is associated for purposes of security public, trade and industry, morality and religion. There is nothing that the human will despairs of achieving by the free action of the collective power of individuals." (Tocqueville 1986, t. I. p. 287-288)

For his part M. Weber expressed, like de Tocqueville, in an article under the title "Kirchen und Sekten" in *Christliche Welt* (1906), the lessons he draws from his time overseas, living in 1904. He undertook the initial finding that operates Weber is: 'the United States, the number of people without confession is low, or the fact of belonging to a religious community has a lot of financial burdens heavier than in Germany for example'. For this author, the United States admitted in a community equates to receive an official guarantee of moral rectitude. Before being accepted into a sect, while recipient is in fact subject to a thorough investigation that dates back to his childhood. By doing so, it ensures that the sect is recruiting an individual whose conduct is "morally qualified". Symmetrically, the new member has a label of ethical quality that can promote social integration and economic success. Not only M. Weber noted the key role of sects but, as Alexis de Tocqueville, he was generally struck by the importance of associative fact. Access to associations is conditioned by a morality and a positive vote. The clubs then create networks of acquaintanceship that produce trust, consequently increasing the chances of credit and increase those economic success. Finally, associations are often based on mutual insurance in case of death or economic difficulties companies. For all these reasons, M. Weber believes that the associations are typical of upward mobility for their members vehicle.

In the early 20th century that the first known of "social capital" mention in a book that discusses the importance of social capital for education and local communities published by Lyda Judson Hanifan in 1916. In a book titled *The community Center* (1920) Hanifan already identified the public and private benefits of social capital when he said that 'the entire community should take advantage of enhanced cooperation, while the individual, for its part, find in civic engagement an essential form of support. The author then defines social capital as "tangible substances that Count for MOST in the daily lives of people: Namely Good Will, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse Among the Individuals and families Who make up a social unit" (Bourdieu, 1986). However, the social capital was nothing but a term used to wear stylish attention to the possible individual and collective benefits of sociability.

Bougie in 1922, addressing the teachers in his Lectures on *Sociology of changing values* (Bouglé 1922) wrote: "Helping humanity to emerge from the animal through a capital c is the task that elementary school itself must assume: to succeed it is important to look at the whole soul of the child and to guide its assessment as well as his knowledge." Half a century later, the study conducted by Jane Jacobs (1961) on American urban communities has highlighted the importance for the survival and functioning of neighborhoods of cities, networks of personal relationships developed over time. These networks, Jacobs writes, are the "irreplaceable social capital of a city. Whenever the capital is lost, (...), the result it brings disappears, never to return unless slowly and luckily a new capital is accumulated" (p. 138). Later, Fronteras Ulf Hannerz (1969), Swedish anthropologist, has also used the term student poor urban neighborhoods. Social capital refers to the resources it reflected in the favors that friends and acquaintances agree other to cope with poverty. Jeremy F. Boissevain then, also an anthropologist, although they have not used the term shows in his book *Friends of Friends* (1974), how the players feel, protect and use their relationships. Although not developing the concept of social capital in detail, economist Glenn C. Loury (1977) introduced the term "social capital" to describe the relevant social resources for individuals. In the use of Loury, social capital is a set of inherent relationships within the family resources, community organizations, which are useful for the development of a child or young person.

1.2 Evolution, definitions and approaches to social capital

After the pioneering work, it was not until the 1980s that social capital suffers a craze of researchers, governments and international organizations. Thus, many researchers are trying to discover the purpose and boundaries of this concept and its impact on development and explanation of social, cultural and economic phenomena. Without being exhaustive we will limit ourselves in this point the authors and schools of thought the most important and influential (P. Bourdieu, Coleman, R.D. Putnam and F. Fukuyama, sociologists and current social networks).

Considered by many researchers as the refounding of the concept, Pierre Bourdieu (1980) developed in France, the first approach to social capital. In a very short text published in 1980 he gives the following definition: "Social capital is the set of actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized knowledge and interconnaissances; or, in other words, to membership in a group, as a set of agents that are not only with common properties (likely to be perceived by the observer by others or by themselves) but are also united by permanent and useful relations." Bourdieu and considers social capital as an individual resource for the individual to benefit from belonging to a network or the extent of his knowledge network and recognitions. "The volume of social capital possessed by a particular agent depends on the extent of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize and on the volume of capital (economic, cultural or symbolic) owned outright by each of those to whom he is related" (Bourdieu, 1986). In his analysis of the relations of domination, social capital contributes to the reproduction of

power positions, which suggests in terms of dynamics of unequal power of actors and conflicts of interest. It thus considers social capital as contextual complement to human capital. Social capital, economic capital and cultural capital and human capital are presented as inextricably linked in an analysis of the company that provides the balance, beyond the habitus, the concepts of social reproduction and class interests. The emphasis here is on personal relationships, the ones that you recognize and can help you and it is this view which is usually applied by sociologists analysts of social networks and inspires a lot of work on relations social.

The second approach to social capital was developed in the United States in the late 1980s by Coleman. The author develops a rationalist and utilitarian theory of society in which he moves away from structural constraints and social determinism and highlights individual behaviors of cooperation, and the moralization of society from the civic virtues of mutual trust, support and help. For this author, priority is given to individuals as actors rather than groups they belong to, whether it be a class, an age group, a professional corporation, a village or city neighborhood. Coleman associates social capital of a group with the structure of the relations of individuals in the group. In his work on the emergence of standards Coleman (1990) suggests the following theses:

- *"There are building social capital when relationships between people change in a way that facilitates the action"* ;
- *"The closure of a system of relationships facilitates the emergence of standards."*
- *"An important form of social capital is the potential information that is contained in social relations."*
- *"When a standard exists, it is an effective albeit fragile form of social capital."*
- *"The creation and destruction of social capital depends on the stability of the social structure."*
- *"An organization set up for one purpose can be used for another; and any form of organization is social capital."*

From these statements we can understand that to Coleman, social capital is embedded in the form of relationships between people, it follows from their collective memory, as it is incorporated into an organization or that it exists only because that it is precisely these people who share a common history.

Through his conception of social capital Coleman sought to develop a tool that can be used to form a general theory of social action whose purpose is to integrate sociological and economic approaches, and so far separated exceed the gap between them. And Coleman (1988) argues: "There are two major trends in the description and explanation of social action. One characteristic of the work of most sociologists, designs socialized actor whose actions are governed by social norms, rules and obligations. The other feature of the work of most economists sees the actor as acting independently and guided by his own personal interest.

By appropriating the concept, it follows the line drawn in the work of Becker on human capital and positioned unambiguously in a non-deterministic perspective of social action and refers to neo-classical economics approaches online. According to Coleman, social capital is a resource for players. The contributions of Coleman, despite the plurality of meanings he gave to the concept of social capital, have been very influential on American sociologists and allowed gradually to forge a clearer definition of social capital. Portes (1998) summarizes well the approach of Coleman: *"Whereas Economic capital is in people's bank accounts and human capital is inside Their Heads, social capital inheres in the structure of Their Relationships. To Possess share capital, must be person related to others, and it is Those others, not Himself, Who are the actual source of his or her advantage."*

More recently, the late (1995,1996, 2000), Robert.D. Putnam, Harvard professor, also presented outstanding work around the concept of social capital. His approach is called a constructivist definition highlighting both the utilitarian nature of social relations but also proactive behaviors and attitudes (strategic) which distinguish individuals who have a share capital. He defines it as *"features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit."* He also proposed a working definition, which introduces the concept of what it produces: *"By analogy with notions of physical capital and human capital -tools and training That Enhance Individual productivity- capital Refers to features of social organization Such As networks, norms and social trust That Facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual Benefit. For a Variety of Reasons, life is Easier in a community blessed with a substantial businesses stock of social capital. In the first place, networks of civic engagement foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust. (...) Finally, dense networks of interaction probably Broaden the participants' sense of self, Developing the 'I' into the 'we', or (in the language of rational-choice theorists) Enhancing the participants' 'taste' for collective benefits."* (Putnam, 1995, p.67).

Putnam, however, suggests that social capital can have positive externalities but also negative. It is therefore necessary to identify measure and promote the development of forms of social capital beneficial to the individual and to society in general. This approach to social capital will cause numerous reactions among social scientists and the number of publications on social capital would from then exploding (Bevort et al., 2006). By positioning itself in a cultural perspective, Putnam differs from the rational choice approach previously developed by Coleman. The author brings out the voluntary norms of reciprocity that enable companies to work well. Associations are the essence of what he calls the networks. Community life is at heart a process that generates civility, cooperation and effectiveness of institutions. Putnam is laying the foundations of the theory of social capital, which establishes a correlation between civic engagement and social, institutional and economic performance. Putnam, a strong society is recognized by the amount of its share capital then defined as "those features of social organization, Such As trust, norms and networks That can Improve the efficiency of society by Facilitating Coordinated actions" (Putnam et al. 1994). Putnam and instead trust between people at the heart of its definition of social capital.

Francis Fukuyama (1995, 2000) took up the definition proposed by Putnam but the closer more Coleman's approach. In *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (1995) and *The Great Disruption. Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order* (2000), he analyzes the process of return of moral values, the reconstruction of a new social order based on solidarity. Fukuyama has a very simple theory: the ability of a nation to develop the institutions that will make powerful and efficient depends on the ability to trust its people, that ability is rooted in the values inherent to culture: *"The one of the major lessons that can be drawn from the study of economic life is that a nation's prosperity and competitiveness are conditioned by a single pervasive cultural characteristic: the level of confidence in own society."* Under this rule, the world divides into two camps: the country "high confidence" and those countries with "low

confidence. "Countries with "low confidence" are characterized by an industrial fabric composed of small, isolated and poorly performing companies. In contrast, in countries with "high confidence," where people, because of their culture, habit relationships outside the family, a vibrant civil society can develop, characterized by numerous intermediary institutions, including one type of institution of crucial importance: the largest private industrial group. The author places at the center of the capital the concept of trust as a key indicator to measure social capital. *"Social capital is a skill that comes from trust in a company or some of its components. It can be incorporated in the smallest and most basic, family, as well as in the larger as the nation and in all intermediate groups social groups. Social capital differs from other forms of human capital because it is usually created and transmitted through cultural mechanisms like religion, tradition, and historical patterns."* It also argues that: *"One of the major lessons that can be drawn from the study of economic life is that a nation's prosperity and competitiveness are conditioned by a single pervasive cultural characteristic: the level of the level of confidence in own society"* (1995). It defines trust as *"the expectation that arises within a community of regular behavior, honest and cooperative, based on commonly shared norms"*. He added that allows the trust to partner with others and work together for common purposes and is based on a "spontaneous sociability" that allows the development of social relations, and therefore the creation of social capital. On this basis Fukuyama gives his definition of social capital that formula as follows: *"An asset that arises from the prevalence of trust in a company or parts of it. It can be embodied in the family, the smallest and most fundamental social group, as well as the largest of the nation, as in all other groups in between. Social capital differs from other forms of capital in that it is usually created and transmitted through cultural mechanisms like religion, tradition or historical patterns."*

In parallel to the work of researchers analyzed above, many researchers were interested in the role of social networks in the development of social capital and economic and social performance. Thus, in line with Bourdieu, Granovetter (1985) argues that the neoclassical model provides a design in socialized man who presents as an atomized be anonymous, and deprived of any social influence through relationships. For him this model obscures the role of social interactions, outside the market, in individual and collective determination of behaviors that affect the economic and social changes. Granovetter believes him when that economic actions are embedded in social relations.

It is in this current study that social networks will lead to a conceptualization of social capital. For Granovetter, there are two types of networks depending on the nature of the relationship between individuals: weak ties and strong ties. It separates the deeper ongoing relationships that we have with such close friends - strong ties - and more distended than it has with knowledge relationships - weak ties. For him, the strength of a relationship can be defined as "a combination (probably linear) of the amount of time, emotional intensity, intimacy (mutual trust) and reciprocal services that characterize this link" (Granovetter, 1973). Weak ties allow to act as bridges between various networks of strong ties, thereby diversifying and increasing sources of information. These information sources are inaccessible in their absence to the extent that most networks, built around strong ties tend to be made up of people with similar characteristics. The network connection is often represented at the individual as all the resources which they have access or can be mobilized.

Lin (2000) directs his thoughts in the same direction as Bourdieu and Coleman, emphasizing the utilitarian dimension of social capital: *«Social capital may be defined as investment and use of embedded resources in social relations for expected returns. Social capital is conceptualized as (1) quantity and/or quality of resources that an actor (be it an individual or a group or community) can access to use through; (2) its location in a social network»*. For Lin, Social relationships are a means to achieve goals and, as resources, their influence is strongly influenced by the social network. To the extent that the network connection is according to Lin (1995), a structure where the positions are prioritized according to the resources held by individuals, there will be more levels within the structure, the more it will be larger and more opportunities will be significant. Lin's approach lies in the perspective of instrumental actions, that is to say, committed to a goal. Social resources are thus a means of achieving this goal, that is to say, to take positions or to get close to actors occupying higher positions. There are therefore two ideas here: those of position and also that of an action, of seeking a point of access to resources. There is also a third idea that exchange: *"One of the presuppositions of the use of social resources is the obligation of reciprocity or compensation"* (Lin, 2002). For Lin, the *"social resources are the backbone of social capital."* *But social capital is the result of investment of an individual in his relations with others"* (1995).

From his side Burt (1995) presents an approach which differs from that of Lin. Burt, social capital is both relational resources held by the actors and the structure of relationships in the network. In his theory of "structural holes", Burt (2001, 1995, 1992) adopts a process of reasoning a contrario. For him, the concept of social capital is better define the lack of social relationships. Indeed, social capital is created when, in the absence of relations between actors A and B, A breeze that void through an intermediary to contact B. This lack of relationship between two actors Burt calls structural hole. The coming into contact with other social networks creates openings for acquiring goods and services from them: Some relationships with some others, trust them, are obliged to support them, they depend on trade up between them. In this context, the absence of relationships (structural holes) represents entrepreneurial opportunities arise intermediate controlling the flow of information and coordination of actions among actors located on either side of the hole (Burt 1995: 602). The particular interest of structural holes is that they can get out of his own immediate social network and reach surrounding social networks. Unlike the immediate network that provides only redundant information, social holes provide access to new information relevant to the goals pursued. To the extent that this information is used as a template for accessing benefits, structural holes constitute social capital. In other words, the creation of new contacts beyond the immediate social circle extends the social network of information and, therefore, enhances social capital. Knowledge and skills quickly, makes all the difference. And this depends partly on the ability of the individual to select the members of its network (knowing the right person) and also the number of people calling network.

2. DEFINITIONS AND CRITICAL TEST ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL CONCEPTUALISATION

2.1 Critical analysis of definitions and approaches to social capital

In light of the above developments we can see that the literature on social capital offers wide variety of definitions and approaches. This diversity reflects both the multifaceted and multidimensional complexity of the concept and also the multiplicity of theoretical fields that were interested in the concept.

The analysis of the proposed definitions shows that if some of them reveal common approaches to the concept, the terminology frequently differs. But it is mainly in how social capital is conceptualized and operationalized as the deepest differences are significant (Narayan and Cassidy, 2001). Indeed, beyond these differences, there are common themes to all the definitions and approaches to social capital that enable us to better understand the meaning. These themes relate to both characteristics of social capital as its sources, dimensions and effects.

Before moving further in this critical analysis, note first of all that the use of the term 'capital' is already surprising. The use of such economic semantics is partly due to the intellectual conditions that inform the conceptualization of social capital in the 1980s explicitly or not, the first steps on the capital went into the path of proposed views complementary to these human capital G. Becker (1975). For example seminal 1988 article by J. Coleman is significantly entitled "*Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital.*" As for Bourdieu, he was a strong proponent of economic theory in general and Becker's micro-economy in particular (Bourdieu, 1984). It is this right that Burt (1995) out of this logic and reposition the debate on social capital had advanced the following definition: "*social capital differs from human capital. The first is a quality created between actors, while the second is a quality unique to individuals (...)* The capital is the contextual complement to human capital." (Burt, 1995, p. 601).

On the commonalities of different definitions of social capital, we can first be observed that, most authors agree on the fact that social networks and social norms are components of social capital. Similarly, they believe that trust is an additional factor to explain the presence of social capital in a community. Some see social capital as a resource that people can use to achieve some of their objectives. To possess social capital, a person must be in relationship with others. Finally, the authors agree that social capital can emerge from all levels of society. As Stone and Hughes (2002) note, the literature identifies social capital in the family, local networks, social networks, formal and informal institutions and state level itself. The OECD (Healy and Côté, 2001), the concept of social capital is directly related to relationships in civil society. These approaches help to identify the sources of social capital. In general, we can say that social capital develops where the establishment of social ties is possible.

However, the relationship of trust and networks also include organizations and public institutions. Social capital is embedded in the norms and institutions that include all public entities.

Similarly, we can distinguish two main approaches to social capital: an approach in terms of values and norms (subjective dimension of social capital) and an approach in terms of relational networks. These different approaches are reflected in the distinction between: cognitive social capital, that is to say, the mental processes of individuals, values, norms, beliefs etc., which predispose agents to cooperation and structural social capital, that is to say the structures (organizations) in which agents act (Uphoff, 2000). Collier (1998) also distinguishes between two forms of social capital interdependent: the government social capital (institutions or organizations established by the State or the public sector) and civil social capital (organizations from civil society).

Franke (Franke 2005) proposes another typology also conceivable: the microeconomic approach that highlights the value of collective action of social capital, the macroeconomic approach that highlights the value of integration and social cohesion and meso approach its instrumental value. The nature of the relationship between agents is specified by the now well-known typology proposed by the World Bank (2000) and distinguished: the link between (bonding), the bond between (linking) and the link that connects (bridging). Links type bonding together individuals of equal status (horizontal links) within the same community. They characterize relations community type, that is to say, people adhering to the same system of representation, they tend towards a "relational closure" (Coleman, 1988) or discrimination. These links may be those within a family, tribe, ethnic group, village, community, belonging, close friends, etc. The type links linking characterize interactions between agents with different statuses. These links are called vertical. These inter-group relationships need to be reaffirmed and are characterized by reciprocal transactions that require further exchanges (Angeon, Caron and Lardon, 2006). According to these authors, the frequency of interactions tends to lead to the convergence of representations. Finally the type links bridging bind remote agents (this distance can be geographical or link is not enabled at all times). Bridging social capital refers to a virtual network. Relationships can be one-off, batch and respected the rules are similar to a mutual commitment without agreement (Angeon, Caron and Lardon, 2006). In summary, this step on the nature of the relationship should be compared with the dichotomous view of Granovetter (1973) distinguishes the strong bonds of weak ties. The share capital of bonding and linking type can be compared to strong ties, while bridging social capital type belongs to the category of weak ties.

2.2 Conceptualization: Definition and dimensions of social capital

Conceptualization requires first define precisely the concept of social capital. While the concept of social capital is widely available, this renewed interest, however, did little to stabilize the concept. So, give a single definition of social capital is a difficult exercise. Given the absence of a definition of social capital, widely accepted by the research community, Woolcock and Narayan tried to summarize in defining what social capital. They thus present its: "*The basic idea of social capital is that a person's family, friends and associates constitute an important asset, one that can be called on in a crisis, enjoyed for its own sake, and leveraged for material gain. What is true for individuals, moreover, also holds for groups. Those communities endowed with a diverse stock of social networks and civic associations are in a stronger position to confront poverty and vulnerability, resolve disputes, and take advantage of new opportunities*" (2000).

Currently and in some consensual, there is consensus to define social capital as "*resources embedded in social relations that facilitate collective action*" (Maxwell, 2001). These resources include networks, trust and values and norms

as well as to encourage collective action. The simple touch and the sense of reciprocity from the links between people and favor the emergence of stronger social skills, which in turn would allow greater citizen participation in the functioning of society.

Social networks are the first dimension of social capital. By network, is a group made up of people related to each other around a common concern. Membership in networks enables individuals to enjoy greater support, better access to information and greater opportunities for advancement. According to Bourdieu, the stock of social capital as an individual depends on the network structure that can weave around him and the amount of physical, human and social capital of members of this network. The literature makes a distinction between dense and sparse networks. The first possible to develop close ties between individuals. This connectivity may be absent more sparse networks in which the links are generally lower, and distanced. Being part of a network generates some benefits to individuals: a stronger social support, better access to information, more interesting opportunities. They can also play an important role with regard to other aspects of social capital. For example, in societies where the level of social cohesion is high, people are better able to integrate social standards. Membership allows some communities to develop a high degree of confidence. As highlighted Putnam (2001): *"An effective norm of reciprocity is bolstered by Generalised dense networks of social exchange. If two would-be Collaborators are members of a Tightly knit community, They Are Likely to encounter plans blew in the future - or to hear about plans blew through the grapevine. Thus reputations at stake They Have That are worth more than Almost Surely the gains from momentary treachery . I'm his sense; honesty is encouraged by dense social networks."*

Confidence is the second dimension of social capital. The confidence level of an individual is determined by his belief that his peers will behave as he thinks they are supposed to. Thus, the degree of confidence of a vis-a-vis individual from another individual depends on the perceived reliability of the first second.

Confidence analysis at two levels, that of interpersonal trust and that of institutional trust. Thus, a first level of analysis, confidence regarding individuals. In this sense, it is interpersonal. It can however be extended to groups and institutions or governments. It is then possible to design a general level of confidence in a given society. Many authors consider trust as one of the essential dimensions of social capital. Others suggest that it does is that it can be both the source and the product, but they recommend not to be confused with social capital. Woolcock (2000) specifies that the trust is exclusively intended to measure social capital. Similarly, Fukuyama (1995) defines trust as *"the expectation that is born within a community cooperative and honest behavior , based on shared standards."* Addressed as well, trust is seen as the product standards, which constitute social capital. Whatever its articulation in terms of social capital, trust produces some benefits. It strengthens relationships, facilitate interactions every day.

Social norms are the third dimension of social capital. They shared attitudes and behaviors. They are also conventions and informal rules that prescribe, prohibit or regulate certain behavior. These standards include, as examples, honesty, respect for the law , ethics in labor relations , credibility , respect for others, tolerance , acceptance of diversity , solidarity in against the poor, etc. These standards are not necessarily written. They can travel by tradition. But they can also be written in more formal laws and regulations. They allow deciphering the patterns of behavior in society and including the idea of reciprocity. This reciprocity reflects the idea that the behavior of an individual replica the other as also suggested by Taylor (1998): *"an individual acts in a reciprocal system characterized by a mixture of altruism and self-interest. He helps his neighbor in the uncertain idea of a future return. But reciprocity is also composed of a series of individual acts which, put together, make them better individuals. "*

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to conduct a literature review on the concept of social capital. We have noted that despite its recent development concept known a huge success and a great effort to theorize was granted. Given the multifaceted and multidisciplinary nature of the concept, it is not surprising that the share capital is subject to multiple definitions and interpretations , some emphasizing the value of resources available to individuals in the form of social relations within their families and their communities , others with greater emphasis on the role of networks and standards in civil society. Although there is still no consensus on a definition, some convergence of opinions is observed.

However, despite these efforts the concept is difficult to grasp in all its dimensions and storytellers as well as its different uses and effects and is "scientifically controversial." Indeed, social capital is a contextual concept. It varies depending on the medium in which it arises and develops. The main determinants of history and culture, horizontal or hierarchical social structures, family, the severity and the economic vitality and characteristics of civil society inequalities. It is essentially a public good in that it is shared by a group, but social capital can also be a private good, people can use it for their own purposes.

Despite these and other constraints related to its measurement and its implementation there is reason to believe that social capital is, as a whole, a potentially useful concept for understanding the role of relationships and networks social and economic development leading to the overall well- being of societies. However, the intellectual work remains to be done , both conceptual and empirical level , before the capital coming undone for good reputation vague concept and be accepted by the whole community of economists was the case with other concepts such as human capital.

References

- Astone, Nan Marie, Constance Nathanson, Robert Schoen, and Young Kim. 1999. "Family Demography, Social Theory, and Investment in Social Capital" *Population and Development Review* 25(1): 1-31.
- Bevort , A. , Lallement, M., and Collective (2006). *Social capital: Performance, fairness and reciprocity* (Editions La Découverte) .
- BOURDIEU, P. (1985), «The Forms of Capital », dans J.E. Richardson (dir. pub.), *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education*, Greenwood Press, New York, pp. 241-258.
- Burt, Ronald. 1992. *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Burt, R.S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 22, 345–423.

- Coleman, James. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital" *American Journal of Sociology* 94: S95-S120
- Coleman J. (1990), *Foundations of social theory*, Cambridge MA: Belknap.
- Collier P. (1998), *Social capital and poverty*, World Bank SCI Working Paper n°4, November.
- Fafchamps, Marcel, and Bart Minten. 1999. "Social Capital and the Firm: Evidence From Agricultural Trade" Washington, DC: The World Bank, Social Capital Initiative, Working Paper No. 17.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* New York: Free Press
- Durlauf, Steven. 1999. "The Case 'Against' Social Capital" *Focus* 20(3):1-5
- Granovetter, M. (1973). *The strenght of weak ties*. *American Journal of Sociology* 1360– 1380.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). *Economic action and social structure* : The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 91, 481–510.
- Granovetter, M. (1990). The old and the new economic sociology. In *Beyond the Marketplace: Rethinking Economy and Society*, (Transaction Publishers).
- Grootaert, Christiaan. 1997. "Social Capital: The Missing Link?" in 'Expanding the Measure of Wealth' Washington, DC:
- Grootaert, Christiaan. 1999. "Social Capital, Household Welfare, and Poverty in Indonesia". Washington, DC: The World Bank (Local Levels Institutions, Working Paper No. 6)
- Hanifan, Lyda J. 1916. "The Rural School Community Center". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67: 130-138.
- Lin N., Cook K., Burt R. eds (2001), *Social capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, New York, Aldine de Grueter.
- Lin, N. (1999). Building a Network Theory of Social Capital. *Connections* 22, 28–51.
- Lin, N. (2002). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action* (Cambridge University Press).
- Lin, N., 2005, *Building a Network Theory of Social Capital, In Social Capital. Theory and Research.*, Lin N., Cook K., Burt R.S. (eds.), Aldine Transaction, New Brunswick, New Jersey : 3-29.
- Loury, Glen. 1977. "A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences", in P.A. Wallace and A. LeMund (eds.) *Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Nahapiet J., Ghosal S. (1998), "Social Capital, Intellectual Capital and the Organizational Advantage", *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 23, n° 2, pp. 242-266.
- OECD (2001), *The Well- Being of Nations: the role of human and social capital*, OECD.
- Ponthieux , S. (2004). The concept of social capital, critical analysis. (Paris : INSEE) ,.
- Ponthieux S. (2003) What the "social capital" , INSEE, Working Paper of the DSDS , No. F0306 .
- Portes, A. (1998). *Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology*. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, 1–24.
- Portes, A., and Landolt, P. (1996). The downside of social capital. *The American Prospect* 26, 18–21.
- Putnam, Robert. 1993a. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Robert. 1993b. "The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life" *The American Prospect* Spring: 27-40
- Putnam, Robert. 1995. "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America" *PS: Political Science and Politics* December: 664-683
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: Civic Disengagement in America* New York: Simon and Schuster
- Uphoff, Norman. 1992. *Learning from Gal Oya: Possibilities for Participatory Development and Post-Newtonian Social Science* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Woolcock, Michael. 1998. "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework" *Theory and Society* 27(2): 151-208
- Tocqueville A. [1835 1840] , 1961 , 1986, *Democracy in America*, Paris , Gallimard , 2 volumes.
- Mr. Weber [1906] 1964 , " Kirchen und Sekten " translated as " The Protestant sects and the Spirit of Capitalism " in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* , Paris , Plon , p. 255-293 .
- Woolcock, Michael. 2000. *Using Social Capital: Getting the Social Relations Right in the Theory and Practice of Economic Development* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (forthcoming)
- Woolcock, M.(2000). *The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes*. (Québec).
- Woolcock, M., and Narayan, D. (2000). *Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy*.